

Financial Regime-Switching Vector  
Auto-Regression  
Amendment October 2010  
New claims, Office Action and Response

Application Number 10/805,314

Mark S. Tenney

Filed 22 March 2004

TC/A.U. 4172

Examiner William E. Rankins

Docket Number MST032204

Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2010

Copyright ©2010 All rights reserved Mark S. Tenney.

Citizen of the United States

4313 Lawrence Street, Alexandria Virginia, 22309.

Phone number 703 799 0518.

Email: [mfc@patriot.net](mailto:mfc@patriot.net)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Intro</b>	<b>19</b>
1.1	Modified introduction to response to March 4, 2010 . . . . .	20
<b>2</b>	<b>Annotated Amendment to the Specification</b>	<b>25</b>
2.1	Underlining review . . . . .	26
2.2	Remove sentence . . . . .	26
2 – 1	new definition . . . . .	27
2.3	Additions to Specification . . . . .	27
3 – 1	Steps in Regime Switching Economic Scenario Generation . . . . .	28
3 – 1.1	Regime Switching VAR Time Node Step . . .	28
3 – 1.2	Regime Switching Time Node Loop . . . . .	31

3 – 1.3	Scenario . . . . .	32
3 – 1.4	Scenario Initialization . . . . .	33
3 – 1.5	Scenario Loop . . . . .	33
3 – 1.6	Regime Switching Scenario . . . . .	34
3 – 1.7	Regime Switching Grids . . . . .	34
3 – 1.8	One space variable one regime index example	35
3 – 1.9	Two space variable one regime index example	38
<b>3</b>	<b>Claims</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Office Opening</b>	<b>51</b>
4.1	Office Action Opening . . . . .	51
4.2	Response to September 22/23 2010 Office Action . . . . .	51
2 – 1	Complete listing of the claims . . . . .	51
2 – 2	Claims in ascending Order . . . . .	52
2 – 3	Cover sheet and signature . . . . .	52
4.3	Status of Claims . . . . .	53
3 – 1	Office Statement . . . . .	53

<i>CONTENTS</i>	5
3 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	53
4.4 Response to Arguments. . . . .	53
4 – 1 Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	53
<b>5 Office Specification Rejection</b>	<b>55</b>
5.1 Specification Rejection New Matter . . . . .	55
1 – 1 Office Statement . . . . .	55
1 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	56
1 – 2.1 2163.06 . . . . .	56
1 – 2.2 Annotated version of specification cites source for contents added . . . . .	56
1 – 2.3 Examiner asked for tutorial . . . . .	58
1 – 2.4 Applicant offered tutorial on side . . . . .	59
1 – 2.5 Examiner said put tutorial in the specification	59
1 – 2.6 Applicant complied with examiner instruction	59
1 – 2.7 Measure theory makes finance very hard to read . . . . .	62

1 – 2.8	Difficulty of math finance materials . . . . .	64
1 – 2.9	Beaglehole Tenney 1991 and Bernanke praise Double Decay . . . . .	64
1 – 2.10	Terminology of additions is used in specifica- tion or prior work or is in industry . . . . .	66
1 – 2.11	Comparison of difficulty level of what added to finance literature and industry use . . . . .	66
1 – 2.12	Comparison to Libor Market Model as typ- ically presented at a more difficult level for lay person . . . . .	67
1 – 2.13	Request examiner to admit he asked for ap- plicant to draft a tutorial explanation for him in the personal interview . . . . .	70
1 – 2.14	Request examiner to admit he instructed ap- plicant to put the tutorial in the specification not just give it him on the side for just him. .	70

*CONTENTS* 7

1 – 2.15 Request no new matter admission over original specification . . . . . 70

**6 Claims Rejections** 71

6.1 Claim Rejections 35 USC 101 . . . . . 71

1 – 1 Office Statement Zero Statutory Classes in Claims 25 to 27 . . . . . 71

1 – 2 Applicant response . . . . . 72

1 – 2.1 Applicant adopts method of use of a computer as start of redrafted claim . . . . . 72

1 – 2.2 Comparison to claim 1 of 6125355 patent . . . 72

1 – 2.3 Office contradictory statements where admit claims are to a method and apparatus . . . . 73

1 – 2.4 Computer system was used to indicate a method of using a computer. . . . . 76

1 – 2.5 In the Bansal claims 25 to 27 based rejections, USPTO reads in use of a computer as intended. 76

1 – 2.6	Use of computer indicated in specification . . .	77
1 – 2.7	Examiner asked for improvement format which implies improvement of something already statu- tory . . . . .	77
1 – 2.8	Applicant requests admission that applicants current ESG computer software system is statu- tory . . . . .	77
1 – 2.9	Applicant requests admission that improve- ments to applicants current ESG computer software system are statutory . . . . .	78
1 – 2.10	Applicant requests admission that Academy of Actuaries ESG computer software system is statutory . . . . .	78
1 – 2.11	Applicant requests admission that improve- ments of Academy of Actuaries ESG com- puter software system is statutory . . . . .	80



1 – 2.12	Applicant requests USPTO to admit that using Economic Scenario Generators to comply with NAIC LHATF actual or draft regulations is statutory . . . . .	80
1 – 2.13	Applicant requests USPTO to admit that using Economic Scenario Generators to comply with NAIC LHATF VM-20 actual or draft regulations is statutory . . . . .	81
1 – 2.14	Applicant requests USPTO to draft claims . .	81
1 – 2.15	Equal protection and due process admissions requested . . . . .	81
1 – 3	Office Statement Two Classes both method and apparatus in claims 29-31, 33-36, and 38-39 . . . . .	82
1 – 4	Applicant Response to Office Statement 2 Classes Issue	83
1 – 4.1	1 class not 2. method is the class in claims . .	83
1 – 4.2	Redraft to the method of using a computer .	84

1 – 4.3	Ambiguity in phrase computer system . . . . .	84
1 – 4.4	6125355 patent claim one . . . . .	84
1 – 4.5	6125355 patent discussion . . . . .	85
1 – 5	Office Statement Mathematical Operations only 25-29 .	91
1 – 6	Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	91
1 – 6.1	Note other 101 responses . . . . .	91
1 – 6.2	USPTO read computer into Bansal for claim 25 to 27 . . . . .	91
1 – 6.3	USPTO finds two statutory classes for claim 29 . . . . .	92
1 – 6.4	USPTO derived one of the statutory classes in claim 29 from claim 28 already having a statutory class . . . . .	93
1 – 6.5	USPTO conflicting statements . . . . .	93
1 – 6.6	Bernanke praises practical use of BT 1991 model . . . . .	94

<i>CONTENTS</i>	11
1 – 6.7 USPTO Bansal intends computer use . . . . .	95
1 – 6.8 Practical use of ESG admission requested . . .	96
1 – 6.9 ESG’s as much practical use as auto parts . . .	98
1 – 6.10 LHATF NAIC practical use of ESGs . . . . .	98
1 – 6.11 Solvency 2 practical use ESG . . . . .	98
1 – 6.12 Additions to the specification . . . . .	99
1 – 6.13 People losing their homes is of practical im- portance . . . . .	103
1 – 6.14 Better economic scenario methods help pre- vent financial crises . . . . .	103
1 – 6.15 Improvements over what Bernanke praised are of practical value . . . . .	104
1 – 6.16 Applicant has licensed DMRP ESG software without regime switching for over 10 years . . .	105
1 – 6.17 What is sold in commerce is of practical value	105

1 – 6.18	Applicant’s methods are already widely used to manage risk in finance . . . . .	106
1 – 6.19	Applicant repeats request to USPTO to draft claims . . . . .	107
6.2	112 Rejection New Matter . . . . .	108
2 – 1	Office Statement . . . . .	108
2 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	108
2 – 2.1	Examiner requested tutorial at basic intro level	108
2 – 2.2	Applicant offered tutorial to examiner on side	109
2 – 2.3	Examiner said to put the tutorial in the spec- ification. . . . .	109
2 – 2.4	Annotated version of specification cites source for contents added . . . . .	111
2 – 2.5	Terminology already in specification and or prior work of applicant . . . . .	112

2 – 2.6	For more detail see this amendment earlier discussion specification rejection . . . . .	113
2 – 2.7	Discussion . . . . .	114
2 – 2.8	Request examiner to admit he asked for ap- plicant to draft a tutorial explanation for him in the personal interview . . . . .	115
2 – 2.9	Request examiner to admit he instructed ap- plicant to put the tutorial in the specification not just give it him on the side for just him. .	115
2 – 2.10	Request no new matter admission over origi- nal specification . . . . .	115
2 – 2.11	Request no new matter in claims admission over original specification . . . . .	116
2 – 2.12	Requests USPTO to draft claims for pro se based on original specification . . . . .	116
6.3	112 Rejection Antecedent Basis . . . . .	118

3 – 1	Office Statement . . . . .	118
3 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	120
3 – 2.1	MPEP quotation . . . . .	120
3 – 2.2	Standard terms . . . . .	124
3 – 2.3	More reference on outside of sphere and like .	124
3 – 2.4	Time node an essential part of a scenario . . .	124
3 – 2.5	Process to stochastic process . . . . .	125
3 – 2.6	Scenarios in preamble in one case . . . . .	125
3 – 2.7	Expected change is standard term and an in- herent part like outside of sphere . . . . .	125
3 – 2.8	New Claims . . . . .	126
3 – 2.9	Applicant happy to work with examiner on antecedent basis as other things . . . . .	126
3 – 2.10	More on Specification Addition request at per- sonal interview . . . . .	127
6.4	112 Rejection Method Apparatus . . . . .	128

4 – 1	Office Statement Claims 29-31, 33-36, and 38-39 are method and apparatus at same time . . . . .	128
4 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	129
4 – 2.1	Computer System Phrase avoided in redraft .	129
6.5	103 Rejections . . . . .	129
5 – 1	Office Statement Claim 25 . . . . .	129
5 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	134
5 – 2.1	USPTO recognizes "computer system used above" in applicant claim 25 not just math- ematical operations and reads computer sys- tem into Bansal paper . . . . .	134
5 – 2.2	Rejection on Bansal missed equity . . . . .	134
5 – 2.3	Bansal CIR model has no equities . . . . .	135
5 – 2.4	Why USPTO asked for introductory expla- nation added to specification. . . . .	136
6.6	Additional 103 Rejections . . . . .	138

6 – 1	Office Statement Claim 26 USPTO reads use computer method into Bansal not just mathematical operations .	138
6 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement Claim 26 . . .	139
6 – 3	Office Statement Claim 27 USPTO reads use computer method into Bansal not just mathematical operations .	139
6 – 4	Applicant Response to Office Statement Claim 27 . . .	140
6 – 4.1	Further on computer and intended use . . . .	140
6 – 5	Office Statement Claims 28-39 same rationale . . . . .	141
6 – 6	Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .	141
6 – 6.1	Claims 28-39 contain matter not in Bansal . .	142
6 – 6.2	Claims 28-31 have DMRP not in Bansal . . .	142
6 – 6.3	32-35 additional restrictions over Bansal . . .	142
6 – 6.4	Claims 35-36 use numerical method unlike Bansal closed form formula . . . . .	143
6 – 6.5	Claim 37-39 use exponential short term rate not in Bansal which is linear . . . . .	143



CONTENTS

17

6 – 6.6

Applicant can help USPTO avoid mistakes in understanding like Bansal here . . . . .

144

6 – 6.7

Applicants prior published formulas are a basic part of math of the CIR models which Bansal builds on . . . . .

145

6 – 6.8

Relation to other parts of amendment . . . .

145

7

Office Action Conclusion

149

7.1

Conclusion . . . . .

149

1 – 1

Office Statement . . . . .

149

1 – 2

Applicant Response to Office Statement . . . . .

151

8

Closing

153

Bibliography

153

